



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE ORIGIN OF THE ABLATIVE CASE

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE CHIEF FACTS in regard to this case are these: it is the only case without special ending in the plural; it has no sign except in the Sanskrit *ā-*, Greek-Latin *ō*-declension; this particular declension is that of pronouns as well as nouns. The inference reasonably drawn from these facts is that the ablative was originally a case confined to the singular of the *ā*-declension; it is usually assumed also that it came into the noun-declension from the pronoun. The form *ὅπω* 'whence' leads to (Delphic) *οἴκω* 'from the house.'

Obvious objections to the facts as here stated are that besides *-ōd* in Latin we have such forms as *praidād*, *airīd*, and that *vacāṭ* is an Avestan parallel to *praidād*.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless it is generally agreed that these sporadic departures are (like *amūšmād*) due to analogy (Avestan parallels are late) and do not represent an original *d*-ablative in other declensions. It is admitted, however, that the *ō*-declension had this ablative apart from pronouns, as it is not only Latin, but (Oscan) Italic (*saka-aklūd*), as well as Slavic (as 'genitive').

In Sanskrit *asmād* has generally expelled *ād*, but, as the *sm*-forms are recognized as double forms (cf. *e-sm-ei* and *pu-sm-e* in Umbrian for *huic* and *cui*), we may deal directly with the simple forms, *ād* and *tād* as ablative (parallel to *ásvād* = *equōd*) of the pronouns *a* and *ta* (stems).

The meaning of the ablative in Latin is confused with that of the instrumental and to a less degree with that of the locative. In Sanskrit the ablative indicates primarily a 'then' and 'thence' idea, leading to a causal notion and almost to the designation of an agent. 'Thence' becomes 'because of' (*énasaḥ* 'because of sin'), but it rarely assumes instrumental sense, though in Avestan 'loved by' may be expressed, as to

---

<sup>1</sup> The ending *-ed* is adverbial, due to accent: *facillimé(d)*. In Sk. the ending might be *-āt* or *-ād*, probably with *d* (pace Kappas, *Der indog. Abl.*).

the agent, with the ablative. Yet we shall see that this is not entirely unknown in the Vedic language. The most remarkable syntactical fact is that the ablative as a separate case-form appears to be quite unnecessary. The Greek and Slavic forms are either adverbial or of genitival relation; Teutonic 'dative' does duty for the idea. Even in Sanskrit, Vedic plurals serving for dative and ablative are usually dative; there is, in fact, no real need for the case. Its various functions are represented well enough by dative, genitive, and instrumental (in some cases by locative). For this reason it tends to die out, even when it has established itself.

Our next group of facts regarding the ablative has to do with the personal pronouns. Here the so-called stem *mad*, etc., serves as ablative, thus: *mád* (or *mát*), *āvád*, *asmád*; *tvád*, *yuvád*, *yušmád*; the dual forms being sporadic for the usual *āvábhyām* and *yuvábhyām*.<sup>2</sup> The distinction in a compound between this ablative and the stem is simply one of accent: *mát-krtam* is 'me-made.' The ending is that of *tád*, *illud*. But, as if *mád* were not always felt as sufficiently 'ablative,' we have also, in AV. 6. 20. 1, *mattás*, in which there is added to the stem-ablative the ending *-tas* found in *tátas*, *átas* (Slavic *otu*): *mattó vilápann ápayati* 'he shall go weeping from me.' If we would get the true semantic quality of the ablative, we must examine the nature of this *-tas*, which is Indo-European.

In Greek *ἐκρός* and *ἐντός* it is evident that the idea of 'from' lies in the *ἐκ* rather than in the *τός*; *ἐντός* is not 'from within,' but 'on the inner side,' though all such examples easily pass into a 'whence'-meaning. Latin has a large number of compounds of this sort, many of which show a merely adverbial force: *claritus*, *simplicitus*. *Persae originitus Scythae* is rather 'by birth' than 'from'; *divinitus* is like *humanitus* ('in a human manner'), though by inference the 'from'-idea is easily found in it. Thus it stands in contrast to *casu*, and (*qui sciat*) *divinitus* is 'prophetically.' So *pugnitus* is 'with the fists'; *communitus* is 'in common'; *medullitus* is not 'from' (*amat*), but more 'to' ('keeps cold to the marrow,' with *servat*); *antiquitus* is 'in ancient times.' Plautus uses *primitus* in the sense 'at first' (not 'from the beginning'), and Terence uses *publi-*

<sup>2</sup> Compare Avestan *thwāt* and *thwāt* and Latin *tēd*, treated as accusative.

*citus* as 'in public' or 'on the public account.' So *penitus* and *funditus* are rather 'at' than 'from.' A very good example is *subtus* with 'fight' in contrast to 'above earth.' Here the meaning is 'fight below,' not 'from below.' So *intus* with the genitive is 'within' (*intus aedium* 'within the house') and may even mean 'into' as well as 'out of,' as in Skt. *ita ehi* is 'come hither' (not 'hence').

In these Latin forms the ending corresponds throughout to that of the Skt. *-tas*, which may at times be interpreted 'from,' but also signifies 'at' and even 'to.' The adverbial use comes earlier in pronouns than in nouns, if we may judge from the fact that the latter are common later rather than earlier, while the former are always common. Moreover, the use of the early examples demonstrates clearly that the 'from'-idea in nouns is really not only negligible but incorrect. We have to do, in many examples, not with such apparent parallels as *ex equo pugnans* and *a tergo*, where a motion-source is referred to instead of its place—for this is merely an idiomatic difference and the 'ablative-idea' is clear, though opposed to our way of speaking—but rather with a form which is intrinsically neutral, simply indicating place, but tending to the 'whence'-idea. There are several Vedic expressions which will not admit the 'whence'-idea. 'Black are the spaces on the trail of the Fire, at his feet,' *patsutás* (RV. 8. 43. 6). Here, as if to guard against the notion that the thought is 'from his feet,' *-tas* is added (not, as usual, to the stem, but) to the declined word in the locative plural. Every Vedic scholar will think of the parallel in RV. 1. 32. 8, *patsutahśī*, where the root of the verb *śī* (कैरति) is added as part of the compound to the same *patsutás* and the dragon 'at-feet-lying' of the victor cannot be thought of as 'lying from' because the locative gives the position. If 'lie' usually went with the ablative or if motion were implied, as when an ablative idea is sometimes expressed by adding a 'from' to a locative (as in Russian *iz-za-stola*), it would be a different matter, but it is never construed with an ablative nor with a preposition indicative of 'ablative' conception. Hence when we find in Avestan *zemada sayanem* (Yt. 14. 31), we must, as the sense requires, translate 'lying on the earth' or, if *sayanem* be rejected, render the ablative as 'on' simply, and not attempt to see 'from' in the case ('he sees on the earth').

If we take the old-fashioned attitude toward the cases adopted by Delbrück and Whitney, it is easy to assume that all ablative phenomena represent either an original or a weakened 'from'-force. Thus Whitney (1098 e): 'The distinctive ablative meaning is not infrequently effaced and the adverb has a more general, especially a locative, value.' This attitude is Delbrück's, who also discusses whether the locative was originally an 'in' or a 'within' case. With a more catholic view it becomes clear that no case begins with a special narrow meaning. From the beginning the locative connotes 'in, at, on' (in space or time) as much as 'within.' So too the ablative, which history shows has started in so narrow a province as the singular of one declension, must be examined without undue deference to a theory. The first step is to recognize two facts, both that in the personal pronouns there is no ablative form other than the stem (that the 'me-made' expression implies but does not express 'made by me,' etc.), and that as *-tas* is an alternative ablative ending (*anyátas*, for example, is the Vedic ablative of *anyá*), the meanings of this ending must be enlisted, and a selection must not be made of them to the neglect of others.

Of course many of the instances are neutral; one may render *ántitas* with 'see' as 'from near' or 'anear'; in antithesis to *dūrát* it is 'from,' especially with a verb of motion. I do not wish to ignore these neutral or adverse cases, but, since they have often enough been exploited, to focus attention on some instances deserving of more consideration than they have received.

Adverbial (prepositional) *-tas*-forms are not common; *parítas* (PWb. 'allerwärts') occurs first in AV. and takes accusative or genitive in later usage. In AV. it means 'on all sides' or 'roundabout.' In AV. 10. 7. 38 it governs the accusative: 'like branches of a tree roundabout the trunk.' So out of the twenty odd cases of *abhítas*, used as adverb or as preposition with accusative, the meaning 'round about,' *sástv ayám abhító jánaḥ* (7. 55. 5), is the earliest. Thus 'thine is this wealth which one sees round about,' and 'thine are all the herds thou seest round about' (1. 53. 3; 7. 98. 6). So in 7. 103. 7, 'singing around,' and even in 5. 30. 10, 'cows lowed around,' it is difficult to conjure up an ablative. And what shall we say of *abhító mā ní śeda* 'sit before me' (7. 59. 7) and *vahatā 'bhító rátham* 'bring

the car hither' (10. 53. 7). Obviously the *abhí*, not the *-tas*, determines the sense. The verb, too, is characteristically not one of motion from: 'thou holdest firm the earth on all sides,' 7. 99. 3; 'stand round the angry lion,' 5. 15. 3; 'kill the dogs around,' 1. 182. 4. The *-tas* is, in the light of the much stronger *abhí*, as with *pári*, almost negligible; at least it is not 'ablative.'

But in *viśvátas* there is no other directive element; it is 'all' in adverbial form, as 'on all sides,' which of course can often be rendered 'from all sides,' just as *ubhayátas* may be one or the other, though when it is said that the sun's 'beams extend *ubhayátas*' it is really more 'to both sides' than 'from,' just as 'the sun wanders,' completed by *ubhayátas*, is probably 'on both sides' (5. 81. 4; 9. 86. 6). This is the case with a mass of 'guard' ('protect' us or our wealth) expressions. Yet even here the really ablative idea is brought out by adding *pári*, as in *pári pāsi viśvátah* (1. 31. 15), *pári pātu viśvátah* (6. 75. 14). Thus 'from all sides we call thee' is *viśvátas pári havāmahe* (1. 7. 10), as 'from the sea' is *samudrāt pári* (1. 47. 6) and 'from here' is *átas pári* (1. 108. 7). The word *viśvátas* alone, so far from expressing the ablative notion, may be joined with the opposite idea, as in the standing phrase illustrated by 10. 79. 5, *viśvátah pratyáññ asi tvám*, and 2. 10. 5, *á viśvátah pratyáñcam jigharmi*, 'fronting to all sides.' One who has a mouth on all sides is *viśvátomukhaḥ* (1. 97. 5-6), namely Fire, whose beams 'go forward on every side,' *prá yánti* (ib.). In 2. 1. 12 'wealth extends on or to all sides' is *viśvátas prthúh*. As Fire gives the wealth it is rather 'to' than 'from' which *-tas* indicates. Quite neutral is *viśvátá ápratītaḥ* of Indra unequalled 'in all respects' (3. 46. 3). Compare 'a mountain broad all around'; 'fire kindled on every side'; 'supports on every side'; 'thou goest everywhere' (9. 83. 1); 'ruling everywhere'; 'you purify everywhere (or altogether).' In all the stereotyped Soma formulas there is scarcely an instance of 'from,' only of 'on' or the 'wholly'-idea. So the sacrifice is extended on (or to, not from) all sides (10. 130. 1) and the allegorical chariot extends 'in all directions' (10. 135. 3). Finally, as Fire has a mouth on all sides and 'eyes everywhere' (10. 81. 2), so Indra is *viśvátodhī*, 'with thought directed to all,' certainly not 'from all' (8. 34. 6; 'überall hin merkend,' *PWb.*).

But, it may be said, do not the adverbs show that *-tas* is 'ablative'? Just as much as other forms. Thus *kúto ádhi prájātam* 'from what is (the divine mind) born?' (1. 164. 18), because *kútas* alone is not ablative enough. The generalized *kútaś-cit* (*-cana*) shows this point: 'fair to see for help established anywhere' (Grassmann: 'überall'). When a verb meaning 'overcome' or 'assail' is used, the meaning of course may be rendered by 'anywhere' or 'from any quarter' (2. 23. 5; 7. 82. 7; etc.), and perhaps in *kó veda yāta ābabhūva* 'who knows where (whence) it arose' (10. 129. 6) or *kúta á jātāh*, though birth and origin do not necessarily require more than a locative idea, *kvā svij jātāh* (10. 168. 3). But in general the pronouns actually have *-tas* forms as their ablatives. Thus, as *anyātas* is ablative, so are *itās* and *tātas* (*nāta īṣate* 'flees not from him,' 5. 34. 4). And in accordance with this the pronoun adverb or ablative (RV. has *ātas*, *itās*, *tātas*, *yātas*, *kútas*, *amūtas*, *anyātas*, and *āntitas*, *abhītas*) directs, so to speak, the real ablative into a more ablative meaning, so that what in itself expresses a general relation becomes drawn into a more specific conception.

As for *-tas* with nouns, *āgratas* is 'in the beginning' and 'at the head' ('born,' RV., and 'marches,' AV.). So *madhyatās* is 'in the middle' (8. 2. 9), though with *údhrtam*, which implies an 'out,' it is 'from the middle' (3. 21. 5); to lead a horse *mukhatās* is to lead it 'by the mouth' (1. 162. 2)<sup>3</sup>; *dakṣinatās* with the genitive is 'on the right' and *savyatās* is 'on the left' (*nī sādī*, 2. 11. 18). To turn to the right is also expressed with *dakṣinatās* (2. 42. 3, etc.). Purely adverbial is *samānātas* 'similarly' (4. 51. 8). Correlative with a locative, *jāne*, is *maryatās* 'among the wooers' (10. 27. 12), and *avārātas* means 'to this side' in 10. 65. 6 ('nach diesseits,' *PWb.*). Such correlation with a locative and dependence on the situation shows that *-tas* and its equivalent ablative wait for guidance to determine their directive force. Hence it is that in Old Persian an ablative does not stand alone but is accompanied with *haca*, while, as we have seen, in old Avestan the ablative means 'on' as well as 'from.' But the locative and the verb 'lie' may also accompany *-tas*, which is thus a place-adverb of general inference.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 6. 3. 4, a horse controlled *āsā* 'by the mouth,' instrumental.

When we turn to the personal pronominal ablative, which is merely the stem, we find a directive word almost always used with the so-called ablative. Thus *ví mác chrathaya* 'loosen from me' and *ápoṣú myakṣa* . . . *mát* (2. 28. 5-6); *āré mát* (2. 29. 1); *tvád āré* (2. 28. 6); *āré asmád* (10. 63. 12); *ápa hí mád aiyeh* (5. 2. 8); *ápa sma mát* (*tarásantī*) *atrasan* (10. 95. 8); but *tvád rejete* . . . *bhīṣá* (8. 97. 14); cf. *yusmád bhīyá* (7. 60. 10), *asmád īsate* (8. 45. 37).<sup>4</sup> The same apartness is given by *ṛté*, besides *āré*, as in *ná ṛté tvát kriyate kīmcánāré* (10. 112. 9). These are all the instances of *mát* except after a comparative or *anyá* and one instance where the ablative approaches an ablative of agent. In regard to the first, the phrase *bhavadanya* shows that a mere stem may do duty for an ablative and induces the converse conviction that in *anyám pátim mát* (10. 10. 10) the last word may be stem alone.<sup>5</sup> Comparatives are represented by two cases of *mát*: *ná mát strī subhasáttarā* (10. 86. 6) and *yáthā mád ádharam vādān* (10. 166. 3)—both in the tenth book. The agent-like form is found in 6. 67. 2, *iyám mád vām prá strñīte manīśopa* . . . *barhír áccha* 'the hymn is sent forth to you from me,' almost (and certainly implying) 'by me' (Ludwig, 'meinerseits').

The second person also is usually accompanied with a directive adverb: *á tvád abhí mām agacchat* 'came hither from thee to me' (10. 98. 2); *má tvád rāṣṭrám ádhi bhraśat* 'may power not fall from thee' (10. 173. 1); *út te stabhnāmi prthivīm tvát pári* (10. 18. 13); *ví tvád yanti* (6. 34. 1); *tvád dhí ví yanti* (3. 14. 6); *ví tvád anayanta* (6. 24. 6); *tvád úd irate* (5. 27. 7); *tvád á* . . . *praketáh* 'wisdom hither (comes) from thee (3. 30. 1); also with comparatives and *anyá* (*tvád anyáh*; 1. 84. 6, 19; 1. 57. 4; etc.); with *ṛté* and *āré* (7. 11. 1; 2. 28. 6); with fear, *tvád bhīyānáh* (4. 22. 6). There are few pure ablatives: *tvád vāvakre* (7. 21. 3); *tát* . . . *īmahe dātrám tvát* 'we seek that gift from thee' (8. 43. 33); *tvád ukthá*

<sup>4</sup> 'Fear' is joined regularly with the pure ablative.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *tvaḍanya*, *maḍanya* (BHU.). The ablative may displace the natural objective, 'my wishes never go elsewhere than (to) thee' *anyáthā tvád*, 8. 24. 11-15 (*vīrataras tvát*). Cf. the stem in *asmātsakhā* (6. 47. 26), *mātsakhā* (10. 86. 1). In *nahí tvád anyáh* (*ásti mardītā*), 8. 66. 13, the ablative is as much stem as in *tvaḍanya* or in *anyākṛtam* (2. 28. 9). In the plural, *anyám asmāt* (1. 129. 10; 2. 33. 11; 8. 75. 13), *kīm anyé páryāsate* 'smāt' (8. 8. 8).

*jāyante* 'born from thee' and *tvád eti dráviṇam* 'from thee comes wealth' (4. 11. 3, 4; cf. *yuṣmád eti*, 5. 58. 4); *má tvát kṣétrāṇy áraṇāni ganma* 'may we not go from thee to strange lands' (6. 61. 14). In *má bhūma nīṣṭyā ivēndra tvád áraṇā iva* (8. 1. 13), *tvád* depends on the *nīs*-force, not on *áraṇāh*.

Much more numerous are the instances in the plural, but they offer nothing entirely new.<sup>6</sup> Yet the greater number of examples shows more clearly that the ablative, while not absolutely dependent upon a directive word with the stem, is normally under its influence. Thus with verbs of releasing, *pra-muc*, *vi-muc*, *vi-yu*, *vi-srath*; *asmád pári* (*jajñe*, 10. 45. 1); *ví* or *úpa dás* (1. 129. 15; 1. 139. 5); *má asmád ví dāsīt*, just like *vy āsmád etu durmatīh* and *ápa asmád etu durmatīh* (7. 1. 21; 8. 67. 15); *asmád á nidáh* . . . *ajeta durmatīm* (1. 129. 6). The *á* and *ádhi* forms deserve special consideration. The former plays a varied rôle: *ety asmád á* 'comes hither on our side,' to us (5. 56. 3); *vy āsmád á kṣāṣṭhā árvate var* 'open for us [from us?] the course for the runner' (1. 63. 5); *vártir asmád á arvág rátham ní yachatam* 'direct the car hither to us' (1. 92. 16). With this meaning should be compared *náro yé ké cā 'smád á* 'whichever men are on our side, are ours' (10. 20. 8) and *asmát sújātaḥ* 'hero on our side' or 'our hero' (10. 99. 7), or *asmád dhrdó ví caṣṭe* (10. 5. 1; cf. *hṛdá á ví caṣṭe*, 1. 24. 12). In such cases an *ádhi* may be joined with locative or ablative. The adverb-postposition is more important than the case. When *á* is in a clause with an ablative implication — *ímá váco asmád á* . . . *sám agmata (asmai)* 'these words have come from us to him' (10. 91. 12), *te* . . . *asmád á* 'from us to thee' (8. 74. 7)<sup>7</sup>—the weak implication is locally strengthened, as when

<sup>6</sup> With *āré* (some half dozen cases) are sometimes joined words merely implying separation. Thus with *vi-muc* of steeds and *āré* with abl., *māré asmád ví mumucaḥ* . . . *āsvān* 'do not halt far from us' (3. 41. 8). So *māré asmān maghavañ jyók kaḥ*, etc. (7. 22. 6; 7. 32. 1); *āré asmát* (8. 2. 20); *mā no gáyam āré asmát párá sicaḥ* 'do not dissipate wealth far away from us' (9. 81. 3); *ápa duṣkṛtāny āré asmád dadhātu* (10. 164. 3).

<sup>7</sup> *iyám te návyasī matír ágne adhāyy asmád á*, S. as *asmāsu* and *te* as *tava*, though by analogy with *asmai* above more like dative (to or for). But it is questionable whether any Vedic poet distinguished a genitive from a dative *te*.

*āpa* is used, so that we may say there are three stages: *śārum asmād yuyotum* (7. 71. 1); *yuyótā śārum asmād ā* (8. 18. 11); and *ārē asmād yuyota* (10. 63. 12). In 9. 105. 6 *sānemi . . . asmād ā ādevam* is followed by *āpa dvayūm*; but *asmād āpa . . . suva* (10. 37. 4), *asmād āpa gūha*, *asmād āpa dvīṣo yuyodhī* (8. 11. 3), and the *vī*-forms with *muc* (7. 88. 7, etc.) illustrate the second stage. The first is scarcely more ablative than is a dative case, 'dispel us the foe.' The second is made ablative by the adverb-preposition, 'dispel off (from) us.' The third is emphatic, 'dispel afar (from) us the foe.' The older hymns, however, show a preference for the ablative without the directive adverb. Thus *sānemy asmād yuyavann āmivāḥ* (7. 38. 7); *tē vīśvā 'smād duritā yāvayantu* (7. 44. 3); *sānemy asmād yuyótā didyūm* (7. 56. 9; also *énas*, 1. 189. 1; *asmād yuyodhy āmivāḥ*, 1. 189. 3); *yuyodhy àsmād dvēṣāṃsi* (2. 6. 4). But an unusual verb or emphasis has the adverb: *vy àsmād dvēṣo vitarām . . . cātayasvā* (2. 33. 2); *jārethām asmād vī* 'sing away (the sinner's design) from us' (3. 58. 2).

The verbal use here is confined to the prepositions enumerated above with two exceptions. These are *prāti vidhyā 'dhy asmāt* 'strike (fight against) for us' (4. 4. 5) and *nā té ta indrā 'bhy àsmād ṛṣvā 'yuktāso abrahmātā yād āsan* (5. 33. 3). The former must be a parallel to *mā pañīr bhūr asmād ādhi* 'be not niggard toward us' (1. 33. 3)—*ādhi* as in *ādhi-vac* with dative of regard. The latter must be joined with *abhī*, and the ablative is also one of general relation, 'these were not unto us' (not 'superior to us'), though both *abhī* and *abhī-as* (so Grassmann) regularly take the accusative. Compare *mó śu vo asmād abhī tāni paūṃsyā sánā bhūvan dyumnāni mótā jāriṣur asmāt purā* 'your deeds in regard to us shall not grow old' (1. 139. 8).<sup>8</sup>

The most interesting cases are those like the quasi-instrumental use already referred to. In 7. 34. 1, *prā . . . etu manīṣā asmāt* 'this prayer go forth from us,' the motion is still plain; in 6. 74. 3, *kṛtām éno asmāt* is to be construed with *āva syatam muñcātam* 'release from us the sin committed.' In 5. 57. 1, *iyām vo asmāt prāti haryate matīḥ*, the hymn is almost 'offered by us,' yet wavers between the full agent-ablative and source-ablative. But in 4. 41. 1, (*stōmaḥ*) *asmād uktāḥ*, the

<sup>8</sup> With *asmāt purā* cf. *pūrvo asmāt*, 10. 53. 1; 10. 54. 3.

laudation is 'spoken by us'; cf. 1. 134. 2, *mandantu tvā . . . indavo 'smāt krāṇāsah* 'may these drops delight thee, prepared by us' ('us-prepared,' like *mātkṛtam*). In 1. 144. 3, *bhāgo nā havyaḥ sām asmād ā* means 'to be called (invoked) by us like Bhaga,' or 'called hither to us,'<sup>9</sup> but in 10. 144. 6, *krátvāyām asmād ā sūtāḥ* is virtually 'Soma pressed by us (on our part)'; so 7. 95. 5, *yusmād ā júhvānāḥ* 'offered on your part.'

Let us now sum up the results of what we have found and see whether they aid us in establishing a reasonable explanation of the phenomena. Adverbs in *-tas* indicate place where as well as from, and when used with nouns the same ending is as much 'at' as 'from': *agratās* 'at first'; *patsutah-śi* 'lying at feet' (locative); *maryatās* 'among the wooers'; so the preposition determines the sense in *abhítas* 'before, around' (not 'from'), 'hither'; in *viśvátas* 'on' or 'from'; *viśvátodhī* 'thinking in (or to) all sides.' This agrees with the use of *-τος* and *-tus* in Greek and Latin; it may be defined as a place-ending tending strongly to express ablative-relation. It is added to nouns in the ablative to strengthen the weaker ablative sense of the ablative-form, which in itself usually requires a directive adverb to bring out the sense. In the personal pronouns the so-called ablative is nothing but the stem, and to give full ablative-sense we have *ádhi*, *pári*, *ā*, etc., *tvát pári*, *tvád ádhi*, or *-tas*, *mattás*, seldom an ablative form alone. When united with a participle, as in *asmād uktás*, we have instrumental sense equivalent to the stem used for instrumental, *mātkṛtam* with *anyákṛtam*. The pure ablative after 'fear' exchanges in Sanskrit with the genitive and with *práti* + accusative. This (fear) 'at' (or 'in regard to') is really the idea of the 'ablative,' which would sometimes have a 'from'-word if it meant 'from' (like *muc*, *yu*, etc.). In other words, the idea is not 'shrink from' but 'fright at' (or 'before').<sup>10</sup>

In Greek the ablative-notion was never fully developed; it was so weak as an independent notion that it was easily carried by the source-idea of the genitive. In Sanskrit also the ablative

<sup>9</sup> As in 1. 92. 6, and so Grassmann, but better 'von uns aus' with Ludwig, who, however, renders 'kommt zu uns' in 10. 144. 6.

<sup>10</sup> 'From' (*ví*) is used only with the causative and not with abl. In 6. 14. 4, *yásya trāsanti sávasaḥ samcákṣi* *śátravo bhíyā*, *sávasaḥ* is abl. after *bhíyā* (not gen. with *samcákṣi*).

easily passed into the genitive, as *cirasya* for *cirāt* and 'fear' with genitive instead of ablative. But the genitive did not serve as origin of the ablative (as Brugmann suggests), for *vācās* (cf. Lat. *vocis*) is genitive before it is ablative. We cannot explain *-tas* any more than we can explain *-as* in *mithās*, *sadyās*, etc. But the pronominal ablative must explain the whole ablative. Now the stem and ablative of the personal pronouns is one with the stem of the demonstrative as to its final *d*: *tād*, *yād*, *kād* are adverbs as well as accusatives, that is, they are stems. From the pronoun *a* we thus have *ad* as stem, so-called accusative or adverb, meaning, as in Avestan, 'then' and 'thereby.' We have a number of such stems serving as adverbs or particles, some used like *-tas* to give an ending. Thus *id* from *i* (cf. *idām* as adverb) besides *itās* (first of place, then of time), used as an ending in *dakṣiṇīt* 'with the right,' as opposed to *savyéna* 'with the left' (5. 36. 4; cf. *pradakṣiṇīt*). Now uninflected forms can be used for full cases, as in *asmāka* and *unser* for genitive and *ásman* for locative, and such forms could in the same way do duty as adverbs serving as ablatives. The adverbs *smād* and *sumād* are merely stems and so *tād* is merely a stem used as an adverb. It is, for example, correlative to a *yātra* and to a *yātas*; it also means 'then' (4. 28. 1) and develops into 'therefore' (cf. *etād* 'this, thus, there' with *átas*) and into an adverb of general relation, 'in regard to.' As correlative to *yād* 'since' it is 'therefore.' Just so *tātas* passes from 'then' to 'therefore,' and the full later ablative *tásmād* becomes an adverb (first in AV.). The parallel *tyād* as neuter 'accusative' is constantly used as adverb, 'indeed.' The pronoun *a* remains only as a fragment, *áyā*, *asyá*; it is almost obsolete, probably owing to its being used in adverbial form, *átas*, *át*, but its stem as ablative, *ad*, is added to other stems, as pronouns are constantly compounded, to give the older ablative, e. g. *tād*, which in turn as adverb is added to adjectives to give an adverbial relation, *adharáttāt*, *uttaráttāt*, as if to strengthen the ablative (cf. *āráttāt*). The form *tād* itself, the old 'ablative,' occurs in RV. only in the sense of an adverb, 'so,' correlative to the corresponding *yād* (6. 21. 6), which also has the meaning 'as long as.' When this *tād* is added to *adhas*, the meaning of *adhástāt* is not 'from below' but 'below-ward,' cf. *vṛścém adhástād* . . . *rákṣas* 'smite the fiend down' (3. 30. 16; cf. *ava-vraśc*).

This explanation is in line with the constant tendency to express ablative relation by other means than the pure ablative. So in late Latin *alius ab* and *doctior ab*. The Vedic *ád* (*a-ad* 'then,' 1. 148. 4) contains its own ablative in addition to the stem-vowel, because *ad* (taken wholly into the adverb-prepositional class) no longer serves as a case. The form *tád* is *ta-ad* or possibly *ta-ād*; like *ád* it has no real ablative sense except by inference. But we have the same phenomenon in other languages. In English, for example, 'at that he rose' implies but does not express 'then.' So 'thereupon,' *darauf*, is local but implies a strong 'ablative' sense; 'thereupon he rode away' is an implication of a precedent action, and it is this implication that brings out the ablative relation. Thus an 'at this,' etc., easily passes into a 'then' and further into a 'hence'; for which reason *ád* stands as correlative to *yád* or *yádi*, 'if' so, 'then' so and so. The stem-ablative appears still in English 'so' from \**suod*, Avestan *hvaṭ*, Greek *ὅττι*, cf. 'who so.' But it is important to observe that *tád* (the stem) itself is adverb, as is *yád*, etc., and it is the ending, not *ad* but *d*, which appears as stem and ablative in the personal pronouns *mád*,<sup>11</sup> *asmád*, etc. Thus the whole ablative reverts to a stem used indifferently as stem or as adverb and as stem used for the neuter singular, *kát* (*kád*), etc., just as neuter nouns generally use the stem for the accusative, *mánas*, *mévos*, and then as nominative. A very good example of the growth of an ablative notion from one not in the least ablative is given by Sanskrit *sácā* 'together, with,' construed with instrumental and locative, as compared with its Avestan equivalent *haca*, which means 'with' with the genitive, but 'in consequence of' and 'from' with the ablative. The root (*sac*, 'sequor') means 'following' and so 'accompanying, with'; but 'following' also suggests 'from' and 'then' as well as 'than.' The relation of the personal pronoun to the demonstrative may be expressed by the formula *tvad:ad:: tva:a*. The stem-form *ad* is extant in Avestan *aṭca*, Latin *atque*, possibly as preposition 'at,' 'to' in *ad* and (*a*)*tsar*, *ad-sar* (*ὀπρώω*). There is no clear connection between *mithás*, *hr̥ttás*, and *hr̥dás*, yet probably there was a genitive-ablative

<sup>11</sup> The form *mát* (*mád*) is occasionally without accent.

force felt in *-as*, whether appearing as adverbial or case-ending, and the very similarity of form made a connection felt between this *-as* and the ending *-tas*, perhaps *tátas* as *tát-as*; hence the accent of *itás* serving as a case: *anyám kṛṇuṣvetāḥ pánthām* 'make thyself a path other than this' (10. 142. 7). But *tátas* also serves as a case (as in the example above, p. 52), and all that can be said positively is that the three endings appear to stand in some relation to each other. On the other hand, it is more than probable that *mád*, *asmád*, etc., are by analogy with *tád*, a stem used as adverb rather than an accusative so used, and that the ablative is a development from such a stem, just as *asmáka* is a stem used as a genitive. As the ablative forms of the personal pronouns are Avestan, the development was of course of remote antiquity.

I have united the explanation of the ablative with that of *-tas* as an adverb-ending also gliding from neutral to positive ablative-sense; but the latter rather illustrates the ablative than explains it historically. That is, the explanation of the ablative may be right and that of *-tas* wrong, though I think otherwise. Apart from theory, *nīṣṭya . . . áraṇa* (above) may be added to Vedic adjectives followed by the ablative, and *asmád uktáḥ* (above, with parallels) to Avestan-Latin ablative of agent, not recognized by Delbrück and explained by the translators rather as 'on our part' than 'by,' perhaps rightly, but by implication clearly meant as agent.